



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,748	06/27/2003	Alex Chou	CHOU3083/EM	5346

23364 7590 08/03/2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SHERMAN, STEPHEN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/606,748

Applicant(s)

CHOU, ALEX

Examiner

Stephen G. Sherman

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 2, 4th paragraph, 2nd sentences it states: "It is thus necessary to provide a control system for digital camera allowing the digital camera to communicate with newly developed digital cameras without the need to change the specification of the digital camera." The examiner suggests the following change: "It is thus necessary to provide a control system for digital camera allowing the digital camera to communicate with newly developed handsets without the need to change the specification of the digital camera."

On page 6, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence it is stated: "The control module 20 functions to control the communication between the digital camera 10 and the handset 19 and to control the operation of ht elements of the..." The examiner suggests the following change: "The control module 21 functions to control the communication between the digital camera 10 and the handset 19 and to control the operation of the elements of the..."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1- 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeffer et al. (US Patent 6,731,952) in view of Watanabe (US Patent 6,498,598) and further in view of Braitberg et al. (US Patent 5,479,479).

Regarding claim 1, Schaeffer et al. discloses a control system for image input device (Figure 4, item 62) enabling an image input device (Figure 4, item 10) to operate in connection with an electronic device (Figure 4, item 48) comprising: a control module to control the operation of hardware and related modules of said image input device (Figure 4, item 62 shows a control processing unit connected to hardware and related modules). Schaeffer et al. fails to teach of a control system comprising an electronic

equipment selection module allowing users to select electronic equipments to be connected with said image input device; and an electronic equipment control signal decoder module to provide a decoder to convert control signals generated by said electronic equipment into control signals operable by said image input device and a firmware memory device to store decoding information useful in decoding control signals generated by said electronic equipment; characterized in that said control system for image input device enables said image input device to selectively communicate with a variety of electronic equipments. Braitberg et al. discloses a control system comprising an electronic equipment selection module allowing users to select electronic equipments to be connected with an adapter (column 6, lines 19-21 it states: "Second, means are provided to determine exactly what phone unit is connected to the adapter cable so that the electronic interface can properly adapt to that phone." The examiner's interpretation is that the means could comprise of allowing users to select the electronic equipment). Braitberg et al. also disclose the control system characterized in that said control system for the adaptor enables the adaptor to selectively communicate with a variety of electronic equipments (column 6, lines 19-21 it states: "Second, means are provided to determine exactly what phone unit is connected to the adapter cable so that the electronic interface can properly adapt to that phone.") Braitberg et al. also disclose of an electronic equipment control signal decoder module to provide a decoder to convert control signals generated by said electronic equipment into control signals operable by the adaptor (Column 3, lines 2-5 states: "An arrangement is coupled to the coded signal connector for determining the type of

cellular phone attached to the opposite end connector of the cable.” The examiner interprets the coded signal connector to be the claimed electronic equipment control signal decoder, which converts the control signals) and a firmware memory device to store decoding information useful in decoding control signals generated by said electronic equipment (Column 10, lines 27-34 states: “Microprocessor 208 then performs a table look-up of data stored in non-volatile memory 212. Non-volatile memory 212 preferably comprises a flash RAM and contains data linking the coded information received from identification logic 224 with data regarding the specifications of the particular model of cellular phone 10.” The examiner interprets the non-volatile memory to be the firmware memory device). Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art to combine the control system for an image input device and an electronic device with the adaptor from Braitberg et al. in order to allow for an image input device that could be used with a plurality of different electronic devices without having to change the hardware of the image input device. Schaeffer et al. as modified by Braitberg et al. fails to teach of a control system comprising an image specification setting module to set a group of factors relating to the specification of images to be input. Watanabe discloses of an image specification setting module to set a group of factors relating to the specification of images to be input (In column 24, lines 50-57 it states: “In the camera adjustment process, the control unit executes operations as receiving an input from the user operating panel 111, outputting a parameter and a command from the digital interface 109 corresponding to changed one of the camera setting parameters 113, displaying a screen of the image data transmitted from the

video camera, and storing the camera setting parameters 113 in the hard disk 114 in the form of a file.” The examiner interprets these camera setting parameters to be the claimed group of factors and the camera adjustment process to be the image specification setting module). Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art to combine the teachings of Schaeffer and Braitberg et al. with the teaching of Watanabe in order to allow for the optimization of the images to be input such that to avoid a mismatch between the parameters of the electronic device and the image input device.

Regarding claim 2, Schaeffer et al., Braitberg et al. and Watanabe disclose the control system for image input device according to claim 1. Schaeffer et al. discloses a control system wherein the image input device is digital camera and the electronic device is handset for mobile phone (Figure 4, item 10 is the camera and item 48 is the handset for a mobile phone). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Schaeffer et al., Braitberg et al. and Watanabe in order to create a control system as described in claim 1 that works between a digital camera and a mobile phone such that the digital camera could work with a plurality of mobile phones without the need of changing any of the hardware of the digital camera.

Regarding claim 3 with respect to claims 1 or 2, Schaeffer et al., Braitberg et al. and Watanabe disclose the control system for image input device according to claims 1 and 2. Watanabe discloses of a control system comprising a memory to allow user to input and to store decoding information of control signals from electronic devices which decoding information is not stored in said firmware memory device (In column 16, lines

25-40 it states: "...a storage unit for storing at least one or more preset imaging device control conditions, and a control condition changing unit for changing the image device control conditions stored in the storage unit." The examiner interprets this to mean that the said storage unit specified here could be either item 106 or item 114 of Figure 1 which are both different from the said firmware memory device, which the examiner interprets to be item 107). Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art to combine the teachings of Schaeffer et al., Braitberg et al. and Watanabe in order to allow for the user to input decoding information into a memory for new electronic devices (mobile phones) that were created after the creation of the image input device (digital camera).

Regarding claim 4 with respect to claims 1 or 2, Schaeffer et al., Braitberg et al. and Watanabe disclose the control system for image input device according to claims 1 and 2. Watanabe discloses a control system wherein factors as set in said image specification setting module comprise at least one of size, initial position, resolution, color and number of gray level of images to be captured (Figure 28 shows different parameters which could be changed in the image specification setting module. Column 14, lines 22-26 states: "The illustrated conventional example includes several kinds of camera control parameters which are changeable, but there exist many other parameters which can be set..." The examiner interprets these other parameters to include those stated in the claim). Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art to combine the teachings of Schaeffer et al., Braitberg et al. and

Art Unit: 2674

Watanabe in order to allow the user to specify the parameters of the image in which the electronic devices (mobile phones) will be accessing.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen G. Sherman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SS

1 August 2005


REGINA LIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER